DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 131 780 HE 008 397

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Booth, Sheelagh C.; Higbee, Eliot C. |
| TITLE | A Comparative Study of Sabbatical Leave Practices in Selected Commonwealth and U.S. Universities. Paper No. OIR-30. |
| INSTITUTION | McMaster Univ., Hamilton (Ontario). |
| PUB DATE | Feb 74 |
| NOTE | 20p. |
| AVAILABLE FROM | Special Projects, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | *Faculty; Faculty Workload; *Fringe Benefits; *Higher Education; *Sabbatical Leaves; *Salaries; Teacher Improvement; Teaching Benefits |
| IDENTIFIERS | Australia; *Canada; New Zealand; United Kingdom; *United States |

ABSTRACT

Sabbatical leaves are viewed as being essential to the ongoing nature of a self-renewing community of scholars. This study was undertaken to provide data on current use of sabbatical leave plans in universities in several countries - Canada; the United States; England, Northern Ireland, Scotland, Wales; Australia, and New Zealand - to provide useful information for possible revision of leave plans. Sixty-six universities were surveyed by means of a questionnaire and the results revealed similarities among the four groups of countries regarding the length of service prior to leave (generally 6 years); differences among the four groups, including the use of retraining leaves as a form of sabbatical; salary paid during regular sabbatical leave; and travel expenses. The conclusions drawn from the data are that Canadian leave plans are not nearly as uniform as those in United States universities; Canadian plans have become more formalized and better documented since 1969; salary paid for full-year leaves in Canadian universities has improved since 1969 and is now substantially better than in the United States, but not as good as in Australia and New Zealand; and participation rates in all countries appear to be higher than those reported prior to 1965 by Ingraham. (JMF)

**********
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
**********

ED131780

Sheelagh C. Booth

Eliot C. Higbee

Assistant to the President -

Special Projects*

McMaster University

Hamilton, Ontario

February 20, 1974

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

OIR-30

# A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF SABBATICAL LEAVE PRACTICES IN SELECTED COMMONWEALTH AND U.S. UNIVERSITIES

HE 008 397

*Formerly called Office of Institutional Research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | Page |
|---|---|
| BACKGROUND, ISSUES, AND OBJECTIVE | 1 |
| METHODOLOGY | 4 |
| RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS | 5 |


LIST OF APPENDICES


Appendix

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| A | List of Universities Sampled | 8 |
| B | Questionnaire | 10 |
| C | Summary Tables | 12 |

# A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF SABBATICAL LEAVE PRACTICES IN SELECTED COMMONWEALTH AND U.S. UNIVERSITIES

## Background, Issues, and Objective

Sabbatical leave plans have become an integral part of academic life in major universities in many countries. Sabbatical leaves are viewed as being essential to the ongoing nature of a self-renewing community of scholars. Ingraham's classic study, The Outer Fringe: Faculty Benefits Other Than Annuities and Insurance, reported, "The fact is clear that the chief purpose for leaves in the university is for research, writing, and study at the level of a trained active scholar furbishing, or sometimes refurbishing, the tools of his craft".[1]

At the time of Ingraham's study, the typical US university sabbatical leave plan had the following characteristics:

(1) Leaves were either for six or twelve months.
(2) They were available to faculty after six years of full-time service.
(3) The common financial support for a faculty member on leave was full salary for a six month leave and half salary for a twelve month leave.

Canadian leave plans were very similar.[2]

Ingraham reported two other facts that bear upon the nature and value of a sabbatical leave program: (1) only about two per cent of the full-time faculty covered by leave plans were on leave in a given year and (2) administrators reported difficulty in getting faculty who were eligible for leaves to take them.[3]

---

[1]Ingraham, M. H., The Outer Fringe: Faculty Benefits Other Than Annuities and Insurance (Madison, Wisc.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1965), p. 72.

[2]A Study of Sabbatical Leave Plans in Canadian Universities (Hamilton, Ont.: President's Office, McMaster University, 1969), unpublished study.

[3]Ingraham, op. cit., pp. 81-82, 246.

A recent study (1972) of sabbatical leave plans in the US, Sabbatical Leaves in Higher Education,[1] indicated that the three characteristics of a typical leave plan cited by Ingraham have not changed. However, changes in these characteristics may be occurring in some universities in other countries, especially Canada. Indications appear that some Canadian universities are moving away from the classical model of a leave plan reported by Ingraham.[2]

During the 1960's most Canadian universities grew proportionately faster than their counterparts in many other countries. The typical Canadian university increased in size from five to tenfold between 1962 and 1972. Competition for faculty was keen. Rapid promotion through the ranks and almost perfunctory granting of tenure were utilized as a means of attracting and keeping competent academic staff. Consequently many Canadian universities now have a higher proportion of academic staff in the senior ranks with tenure than do similar US universities.[3]

No one in academe needs to be reminded that the North American enrolment boom of the sixties is over. As a result, many Canadian and US universities will not be able to increase their total number of academic staff. In order to maintain academic flexibility, they will have to use every resource available. If a sabbatical leave is truly a time when a trained, active scholar furbishes or refurbishes the tools of his craft, then a carefully designed and administered leave plan has potential for providing a university with some measure of flexibility. An awareness of this potential and a corresponding attempt to utilize it may place sabbatical leaves in a new perspective.

---

[1]Eberle, A. W., and R. E. Thompson, Sabbatical Leaves in Higher Education (Bloomington, Indiana: Student Association of Higher Education, University of Indiana, 1973).

[2]Evidence of this move came from two sources: (1) the use of leaves specifically for retraining (see Table I, Appendix C), and (2) individual conversations with administrators in Canadian universities.

[3]This conclusion is based on data reported by William R. Mann in "Is the Tenure Controversy a Red Herring?" Journal of Higher Education XLIV, Number 2 (February, 1973), 85, as compared to data on Canadian universities developed by the Office of Institutional Research at McMaster University (unpublished).

At the time of Ingraham's study only about half of those faculty who became eligible for leave in US universities actually took it.[1] Participation in the sabbatical leave plans of several Canadian universities was similar to that described by Ingraham.[2] Given the present level of turnover in Canadian universities, under a steady state academic staff situation (no net new staff), on the average 10-16% of the staff could be eligible for leave in any one year. At a 50% participation rate, a university could find itself with 5%-8% of its staff on leave each year instead of the 2% reported by Ingraham. Some Canadian universities already have up to 11% of their staff on leave in a given year.[3]

That situation has several ramifications, some positive and some negative. First some of the negative ramifications:

(1) Departments may have more difficulty scheduling course offerings.
(2) The university may not have adequate finances to provide the necessary replacements, thus requiring faculty to delay leaves.
(3) Competition for travel and research funds from outside granting agencies may become stiffer, thus causing faculty increased difficulty in arranging support for leaves.

Now some of the positive ramifications:

(1) The concept of a leave as a tool to increase a university's flexibility may be strengthened.
(2) The sabbatical leave may become an integral part of staff planning in universities.
(3) University administrators may seek to improve leave plans in order to encourage higher participation rates.

---

[1]Ingraham, M.H., The Outer Fringe, Appendix III, Table 37, p. 246.

[2]A Study of Sabbatical Leave Plans in Canadian Universities (Hamilton, Ont.: President's Office, McMaster University, 1969), unpublished study.

[3]See Appendix C, Table #12.

In order to provide data on the current use of sabbatical leave plans in universities in the countries listed earlier, especially Canadian universities, the Office of Institutional Research at McMaster University conducted the survey reported here. The goal underlying the study was to gain information that could be used by universities in assessing possible revisions to their leave plans in order to align them with the demands of the seventies.

The specific objective of the study was threefold:

(1) To summarize data on sabbatical leave plans in selected Canadian universities.
(2) To ascertain whether a shift had occurred in the plans in these universities as measured against the results a previous study (1969).
(3) To compare the sabbatical leave plans in these universities with those in selected universities in several other countries.

## Methodology

In view of the objective of the study, a sample was selected to provide data on groups of universities with which comparisons were intended. This rationale limited the sample to those Canadian universities responding to an earlier study (1969) and a subset of universities in certain other countries that could be described as prestigious, multi-purpose universities. A complete list of the 66 universities in the sample is contained in Appendix A. No attempt was made to make the sample representative of certain geographic, cultural, economic, etc. areas. Nor was stratifying done by type of control, size, etc.

Appendix B contains a copy of the questionnaire sent to each university in the sample. For the purpose of the summaries presented in this report, the countries in the sample were grouped as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Group #1 | Canada |
| Group #2 | United States |
| Group #3 | England, Northern Ireland, Scotland, Wales |
| Group #4 | Australia and New Zealand |

The rationale for this grouping was based on the academic traditions of the various countries, as well as the desire to obtain meaningful group sizes. Australia/New Zealand, Canada, England, and the US clearly

have their own unique academic traditions. While Northern Ireland, Scotland, and Wales may also have their own unique traditions, the number of universities in those countries was too small to consider them as separate comparable groups. And in fact their academic origins are close to those in England. Thus a "Great Britain" grouping was used. Academic folklore suggests that leave plans in Australia and New Zealand are superior to those anywhere else in the free world since faculty from those countries have to travel so far to be anywhere else.

The following section describes the results of the survey and general conclusions derived from those results. The reader should interpret the results and conclusions in the light of the inherent difficulties in such a survey. Obviously the reliabilities of the results vary among the questions for a given institution and among the institutions for a given question. For example, misunderstanding by the respondent re Question 2 would be difficult. However, on Question 1 it would be relatively easy because of the different terminology and academic traditions in use in different institutions. With respect to those Canadian institutions in the sample, the reliability of response is likely to be higher than for, say, institutions from Great Britain for two logical reasons. First, the Canadian institutions had been sampled before and a continuing dialog about sabbatical leave plans developed between McMaster University and some of those universities. Second, the researcher knew personally persons and situations at several of the Canadian universities in the sample.

In view of these inherent problems in reliability, every effort was made to categorize ambiguous responses properly. If a categorization of a response to a given question was not apparent, the response was deleted from the summary. However, as an example of possible inherent errors, what one university calls a special retraining leave may be called a negotiated leave in another university. Therefore the results are presented in their totality rather than in the form of averages, significant tests for differences, etc.

## Results and Conclusions

Appendix C contains a summary table for each question on the questionnaire. The number of the table in Appendix C corresponds to the number of the question on the questionnaire in Appendix B. The tables are largely self-explanatory. Therefore this section will focus on the highlights of the results, emphasising the similarities and differences in sabbatical leave practices among the countries in the survey.

Completed responses were obtained from 58 of the 66 universities sampled (88%). The highest response rate (100%) was obtained from the Australia/New Zealand group, followed by Great Britain (93%), Canada (91%), and the US (75%).

Similarities among the four groups of countries

The length of service required prior to leave is still almost universally set at 6 years for a full year's leave. Some universities provide 6 months leave after 3 years' service. Universities on the quarter system have equivalent requirements stated in quarters. Everyone (with only one exception in the Great Britain group) expects persons to return after leave. This expectation is usually stated in university regulations related to the sabbatical leave plans. Faculty on leave are usually only replaced if the department cannot carry on its work without replacement. Most universities (except in the US) provide negotiated leaves for non-academic staff.

Differences among the four groups of countries

Apart from the similarities discussed in the previous section, striking differences among the groups of countries occur in several areas:

(1) The use of retraining leaves as a form of sabbatical leave. Approximately half the universities in Canada and Great Britain have such special leaves, whereas none of the US and only one Australia/New Zealand university reported them.

(2) Salary paid during regular sabbatical leave. The average in Canadian universities was approximately 90% for six months and 75% for twelve months. The US averages are 100% and 50% respectively. British universities usually pay 100% for everything, but on a very ad hocish basis with very informal regulations. Australia/New Zealand universities also usually pay 100%.

(3) Travel expenses. Only the Australia/New Zealand universities regularly pay as a matter of policy travel expenses.

Results of the other aspects of the sabbatical leave plans investigated provided neither strong similarities nor marked differences. Thus the reader will have to study the tables and draw conclusions based on his or her own perspective.

General conclusions

The objective data reported here and the subjective inferences drawn during the survey suggest several general conclusions. These conclusions are presented in view of the specific objective of the study (see page 1).

Sabbatical leave plans in Canadian universities are not nearly so uniform as those in US universities or as those in Canadian universities were in 1969 (based on data presented here as compared with that obtained in the 1969 McMaster University survey referenced earlier). Present leave plans in Canadian universities are more like those in Great Britain in that they are becoming tailored to the needs of a given university(diversity) while still retaining their universality as an integral part of the life of a self-renewing community of scholars.

Plans in Canadian universities have become more formalized and better documented since 1969. More importantly they are becoming viewed as a tool for maintaining university flexibility.

The salary paid for full year leaves in Canadian universities has improved since 1969 and is now substantially better than in the US, but not as good as in Great Britain and not nearly as good as in Australia/New Zealand. The academic folklore about the superiority of Australia/New Zealand sabbatical leave plans was borne out by the study. This superiority obviously has its roots in the need for faculty from those countries to travel abroad to pursue their scholarship.

Participation rates in all countries appear to be higher than those reported by Ingraham. This phenomenon is probably due to several reasons, among them more mature age-rank profiles, lower mobility, increased opportunities, the use of leaves as retraining opportunities, etc.

Clearly the importance of sabbatical leave plans in academe has, as a result of the many factors shaping institutions of higher education, increased and concomitantly affected many aspects of university programing. That trend will likely continue, especially if participation rates continue to rise.

# APPENDIX A

## LIST OF UNIVERSITIES SAMPLED

### Canada

Acadia University, Wolfville, Nova Scotia
University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta
University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta
Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario
Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia
University of Guelph, Guelph, Ontario
Universite Laval, Quebec, Quebec
University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba
Memorial University, St. John's, Newfoundland
McGill University, Montreal, Quebec
Universite de Montreal, Montreal, Quebec
University of New Brunswick, Fredericton, New Brunswick
Nova Scota Tech., Halifax, Nova Scotia
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Toronto, Ontario
Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario
St. Francis Xavier University, Antigonish, Nova Scotia
University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan
Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, British Columbia
Sir George Williams, Montreal, Quebec
University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario
University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario
University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario
University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario

### United States

California Institute for Technology, Pasadena, California
University of California at Berkeley, California
University of California at Los Angeles, California
University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado
Cornell University, Ithaca, New York
Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts
University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois

February 20, 1974

United States (continued)

Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland
Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan
State University of New York at Stoney Brook, New York
Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio
University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma
University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey
Stanford University, Stanford, California
University of Texas at Austin, Texas
University of Washington, Seattle, Washington
Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut

Great Britain

Queen's University, Belfast, Northern Ireland
University of Birmingham, Birmingham, England
University of Bradford, Bradford, England
University of Bristol, Bristol, England
University of Cambridge, Cambridge, England
University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, Scotland
University of Glasgow, Glasgow, Scotland
University of Leeds, Leeds, England
University of London, London, England
University of Oxford, Oxford, England
University of St. Andrews, St. Andrews, Scotland
University of Sussex, Brighton, England
New University of Ulster, Coleraine, Northern Ireland
University of Wales, Cardiff, Wales
University of Wales Institute of Science and Technology, Cardiff, Wales

Australia and New Zealand

University of Adelaide, Adelaide, South Australia
University of Melbourne, Parkville, Victoria, Australia
Monash University, Clayton, Victoria, Australia
University of New South Wales, Kensington, New South Wales, Australia
University of Sydney, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia
University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand
University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand
Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington, New Zealand

February 20, 1974

APPENDIX B

OIR-30
10

## SURVEY OF LEAVE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES IN SELECTED UNIVERSITIES

Note: Questions (1) through (12) apply to academic staff only. Question (13) applies to non-academic staff. Attach another sheet to this form to record any additional comments.

(1) Type of leave available at your University:

Regular sabbatical leave ☐ Retraining leave ☐

Special negotiated leave ☐

(2) Length of service required for eligibility for sabbatical leave _____

(3) Conditions pertaining to eligibility for retraining leaves and special negotiated leave. Please comment.

_____

_____

_____

(4) Percent of salary paid during leave:

| | 6 Month Leave | Full Year Leave |
|---|---|---|
| Regular sabbatical leave | | |
| Retraining leave | | |
| Special negotiated leave | | |

(5) Does an overall limit exist on the total funds available for leaves in any one year?

Yes ☐ No ☐

(6) Does an overall limit exist on the number of faculty who may be on leave in any one year?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Please comment.

_____

_____

(7) Is the faculty member expected to return to the University after leave?

Yes ☐ No ☐

(8) Is the faculty member required to report on the leave activities upon return to the University?

Yes ☐ No ☐

(9) What travel expenses or other allowances are provided for leaves? Please comment.

_____

_____

(10) Are special arrangements made for sabbatical leaves for academic administrators (including department chairmen) either before or after their term of academic administration? Please comment.

_____

_____

(11) To what extent are faculty members on sabbatical leave replaced? Please comment.

_____

_____

(12) What has been the participation rate for regular sabbatical leaves (i.e., what percentage of those eligible for leave actually take leave)? _____

(13) Has this participation rate changed as a result of improvement in the leave plan? Please comment if necessary.

Yes ☐ No ☐

_____

_____

(14) What leaves are available to senior non-academic staff? Please comment.

_____

_____

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Would you like to receive a copy of the results of this survey?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Please return to:

Eliot C. Higbee
Office of Institutional Research
McMaster University
Hamilton, Ontario
L8S 4L8
Canada

Name of Respondent
(Please Type or Print)

_____

Institution

_____

February 20, 1974

APPENDIX C

SURVEY OF LEAVE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES IN SELECTED UNIVERSITIES

A questionnaire (attached) was mailed to institutions in Canada, the United States, Great Britain and Northern Ireland. and Australia and New Zealand. These countries have been grouped and numbered as follows:

| Country | Group | Sample Size | No. of Univs. Responding |
|---|---|---|---|
| Canada | 1 | 23 | 21 |
| United States | 2 | 20 | 15 |
| Great Britain & N. Ireland | 3 | 15 | 14 |
| Australia & N. Zealand | 4 | 8 | 8 |
| | | 66 | 58 |

Table I (Question #1) TYPE OF LEAVE AVAILABLE

| Group | Reg. Sabb. Leave | Retraining Leave | Special Negotiated Lv. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 18 | 8 | 20 |
| 2 | 11 | 0 | 10 |
| 3 | 5 | 3 | 12 |
| 4 | 6 | 1 | 6 |

Table II (Question #2) LENGTH OF SERVICE REQUIRED FOR ELIGIBILITY FOR SABBS.

| Group | No. of Universities | Length of Service |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 13 | 6 |
| | 1 | 7 |
| | 2 | 3/6 |
| | 1 | 4/6 |
| | 1 | 5/6 |
| 2 | 8 | 6 |
| | 2 | 7 |
| | 1 | 6 quarters |
| 3 | 1 | 6 |
| | 1 | 4 |
| | 1 | 3 |
| | 1 | 3/6 |
| | 1 | 6 terms |

LENGTH OF SERVICE (Continued)

| Group | No. of Universities | Length of Service |
|---|---|---|
| 4 | 3 | 3/6 |
| | 1 | $5\frac{1}{2}$ |
| | 1 | $6/4\frac{1}{2}$ |
| | 1 | 4/5/6 |
| | 1 | varies |

Table IV (Question #4)*
PERCENT OF SALARY PAID DURING LEAVE

A. Sabbatical Leave

| Group | No. of Universities | 12 month leaves | 6 month leaves |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 4 | 75 | |
| | 4 | 80 | |
| | 3 | 50 | |
| | 2 | 100 | |
| | 1 | 60 | |
| | 1 | 60-100 | |
| | 1 | 0-100 | |
| | 1 | 75-100 | |
| | 1 | 50-67 | |
| | 8 | | 100 |
| | 2 | | 80 |
| | 1 | | 70 |
| | 1 | | 80-100 |
| | 1 | | 75-100 |
| 2 | 10 | 100 | |
| | 10 | | 100 |
| | 1 | 67 | |
| | 1 | | 75 |

February 20, 1974

*Responses to Question 3 not included as these took the form of comments on conditions pertaining to eligibility for retraining and special leaves, and they did not lend themselves to tabular presentation.

PERCENT OF SALARY PAID DURING LEAVE (continued)--Sabbatical Leaves

| Group | No. of Universities | 12 months | 6 months | 3 months |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | 3 | 100 | | |
| | 3 | | 100 | |
| | 1 | Negotiated | | |
| | 1 | | | 100 |

| 4 | No. of Universities | 12 months | 8 months | 6 months |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 5 | 100 | | |
| | 4 | | | 100 |
| | 1 | | 100 | |

B. Special Negotiated Leave

| Group | No. of Universities | 12 month leaves |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 6 | 0 |
| | 4 | Negotiable |
| | 2 | 50 |
| | 1 | 33 1/3 |
| | 1 | 0-50 |
| | 1 | 0-12 |
| | 1 | 1 month for ea. yr. |
| | 1 | 50 after 4 yrs. |
| | 1 | 100 for 6 months |
| | 1 | 0-100 |
| | 1 | 80 for 6 mos. after 3 yrs. |

| 2 | No. of Universities | 12 months | 6 months |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 2 | | 100 |
| | 1 | | 50-67 |
| | 2 | 0 | |
| | 3 | Negotiated | |
| | 2 | 0-100 | |
| | 1 | 50 | |
| | 1 | 50-100 | |

| 3 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 5 | 0-100 | |
| | 5 | 0 | |
| | 1 | 100 | |
| | 1 | | 0-100 |
| | 1 | | 100 |

PERCENT OF SALARY PAID DURING LEAVE (Continued)--Special Neg. Leave

| Group | No. of Universities | 12 months | 6 months |
|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | 2 | 0 | 100 |
| | 1 | Ad Hoc | |
| | 1 | 1 mo. pay for ea. 6 mo. served | |

C. Retraining Leave --Group 2 had none

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 100 | |
| | 2 | 50 | |
| | 2 | 0-100 | |
| | 1 | $2000 | |
| | 1 | 12½% for ea. yr. served | |
| | 2 | | 100 |
| 3 | 2 | 100 | |
| | 2 | | 100 |
| 4 | 1 | 100 | 100 |

Table V (Question #5)
OVERALL LIMIT ON FUNDS AVAILABLE IN ONE YEAR

| Group | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 10 | 11 |
| 2 | 2 | 11 |
| 3 | 3 | 8 |
| 4 | 6 | 2 |

Table VI (Question #6)
OVERALL LIMIT ON FACULTY ON LEAVE IN ONE YEAR

| Group | Yes | No | No-Conditionally |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 7 | 14 | - |
| 2 | 2 | 6 | 6 |
| 3 | 2 | 3 | 8 |
| 4 | 1 | - | 7 |

Table VII (Question#7)
RETURN OF FACULTY MEMBER EXPECTED AFTER LEAVE

| Group | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 21 | - |
| 2 | 15 | - |
| 3 | 11 | 1 |
| 4 | 8 | - |

February 20, 1974

Table VIII (Question #8)
REPORT BY FACULTY MEMBER EXPECTED

| Group | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 11 | 10 |
| 2 | 6 | 6 |
| 3 | 3 | 8 |
| 4 | 8 | - |

Table IX (Question #9)
TRAVEL EXPENSES OR OTHER ALLOWANCES

| Group | Yes | No | Negotiable |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 3 | 16 | 1 |
| 2 | - | 12 | 1 |
| 3 | 1 | 3 | 8 |
| 4 | 8 | - | - |

Table X (Question #10)
LEAVES FOR ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS ARRANGED

| Group | Yes | No | Negotiable |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 11 | - | 7 |
| 2 | 6 | 6 | 2 |
| 3 | 1 | 9 | 1 |
| 4 | - | 7 | 1 |

Table XI (Question #11)
REPLACEMENT OF FACULTY ON LEAVES

| Group | Not Replaced | In most cases Dept. carries load Usually only replaced if necessary |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 1 | 18 |
| 2 | 1 | 13 |
| 3 | 2 | 10 |
| 4 | 3 | 5 |

Table XII (Question #12)
PARTICIPATION RATE OF THOSE ELIGIBLE FOR SABBATICAL LEAVES

| Group | 80-90 | 70-79 | 50-69 | 25-49 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| 2 | - | - | 2 | 1 |
| 3 | 1 | - | - | - |
| 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - |

% OF TOTAL FACULTY AWAY IN A YEAR

| Group | 0-4 | 5-9 | 10-19 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | - | 3 | 2 |
| 2 | 1 | - | 1 |
| 3 | - | 1 | 1 |
| 4 | - | - | 1 |

Table XIII (Question #13)
CHANGE IN PARTICIPATION RATES A RESULT OF POLICY CHANGE

| Group | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 4 | 7 |
| 2 | - | 10 |
| 3 | 1 | 4 |
| 4 | 3 | 2 |

Table XIV(Question #14)
LEAVES FOR NON-ACADEMIC STAFF

| Group | Yes--Negotiated | No |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 15 | 2 |
| 2 | 7 | 6 |
| 3 | 7 | 4 |
| 4 | 7 | - |